

protection under the law for being who they are. Yesterday Republicans tried to block an important provision to protect gays, lesbians, transgenders, and bisexuals from being targeted, harassed, injured, or even killed due to acts of bias and hatred. The Matthew Shepherd Hate Crimes Prevention Act would give the LGBT community the same protections already provided to other groups that have been discriminated against in our Nation's history.

Many are familiar with the hatred and bigotry perpetrated against people of different races and religions. Take the case of Kenny Chiu, a 17-year-old Asian American from Orange County, California, who was simply standing in the driveway of his own home when he was grabbed and brutally stabbed 26 times. In the last hour of his life, he was able to identify his killer. It was his 20-year-old next-door neighbor, who was a Neo-Nazi sympathizer and was looking for a minority to kill.

But members of the LGBT community face the same harassment every day just for being who they are. Larry King was a gay eighth-grader from Ventura, California, who used to come to school dressed differently. He was the subject of great harassment. Other boys made fun of him, called him names, and threw wet paper towels at him in the boys' restroom. Then one morning behind the computer lab at his junior high school, a fellow classmate shot him twice in the head. In contrast to the case of Kenny Chiu, Larry King's murder is not covered by our Federal hate crimes law. This must change.

When asked by my constituents why I support this bill, I describe my experience as Chair of the California State Assembly's Select Committee on Hate Crimes, where I held hearings on hate crimes across all the communities of the State. After hearing these horrific stories and listening to their heartbroken families, I know I cannot fight for the civil rights of one group without fighting for the civil rights of the other. Things will not change until people stand up and say we will not tolerate making anybody in America a second-class citizen. As long as intolerance exists, as long as there are people out there that turn a blind eye to hate and bigotry, then we as a human race are doomed to repeat the horrors of the past.

In California what happened to Larry King is considered a hate crime. It is one of only five States in the Nation that include sexual orientation and gender identity in the definition of a hate crime. But in the Nation many are left without such protection because Federal law leaves many States without the resources or expertise to effectively investigate and prosecute bias-motivated violent crimes in the LGBT community. That is why tomorrow we must pass the Matthew Shepherd Hate Crimes Prevention Act so that every teenager who goes to school can be who they are knowing they are

protected by the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAVING A MILLION JOBS AT \$787,000 PER JOB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, in a column last month for RealClearMarkets, businessman Bill Frezza took on the idea that the stimulus package had somehow "saved" jobs in America. He writes:

"The White House Council of Economic Advisers said Thursday the \$787 billion stimulus plan kept 1 million people working who would otherwise not have had jobs.

"You wouldn't let me stand up and make the simplistic claim that these million jobs were saved at a cost of \$787,000 per job without challenging the details of my accounting, would you? Surely reality is more complex.

"But when the White House Council of Economic Advisers calculated the number of jobs saved by our government's massive stimulus spending, how is it that they entirely neglected to account for the impact on employment of removing \$787 billion from the balance sheet of the private economy?"

He continues by discussing those from the White House Council of Economic Advisers who make these dubious claims about the so-called "saved" jobs:

"They never had to meet a payroll," Mr. Frezza writes. "They never had to raise money to fund their businesses from skeptical investors. They never bet their life savings on their own business judgment. They never had to scramble to pay off a banker who called in a loan. They never had to decide whether to take a calculated risk to expand their workforce, hoping to take market share from a fierce competitor. They never had to make a judgment call on whether or not to launch an unproven new product. They never had to manage a new reduction in force, explaining to employees that their jobs have been eliminated because the tax and regulatory burdens imposed by some new law forced them to cut costs.

"They never lost business to a government-subsidized competitor whose cost of capital was vastly lower than theirs. They never had to grease the palms of politicians offering constituent services to resolve a bureaucratic hangup caused by the labyrinthine government approvals these self-same politicians inflict on many businesses.

"They never had to deal with a missed sales forecast caused by an economy so roiled by capricious and uncertain fiscal policy that frightened customers were holding back orders. They never had to deal with a key supplier that unexpectedly went bankrupt because their source of credit dried up as dollars got sucked out of the commercial economy into government debt. They never had to negotiate with angry landlords after being forced to shut down a business destroyed by spurious mass-manufactured class-action suits. They never had to stand up in front of disappointed investors to explain why they lost money that had been entrusted to them.

"And you can be sure that none of them ever fell on their face and had to pick themselves up, dust themselves off, and decide whether it was worth going through all the joys described above to take another shot at building a business from scratch."

Then he launches into his final broadside against the assumption of the council's economists:

"All three have Ph.D.s from fancy universities," he writes. "They are prize-winning experts in macroeconomics. To have come this far, you can bet they are ambitious, articulate, well connected, and brilliant. Yet when the Council of Economic Advisers did its calculations to determine the numbers of jobs saved by the stimulus, they shamelessly counted assets and totally ignored liabilities.

"People this smart cannot be easily fooled. People so visibly in the public eye cannot remain willfully blind.

"No, these people and those who appointed them are cunningly smart. It's we who are the fools for listening to them. Long after these experts return to their sinecures in academia to train another generation of economists on the wisdom of central planning and Keynesian pump priming, it's we and our children and our grandchildren who will be paying the price."

□ 1915

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GRAYSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INGLIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE MACKAY FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.